

REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, Applicant requests acknowledgement of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. §119. A certified copy of the priority document has been filed on October 30, 2003, along with the application. Also, an initialed copy of form PTO-1449 indicating consideration of references submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement filed on February 6, 2004, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Yoo et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection because the cited reference does not disclose or suggest second slits being formed in a second electrode and extending in a direction nearly at right angles with the direction in which first slits that are formed on the first substrate opposite the second substrate, extend.

The Office Action states that “Yoo discloses the angle (between the slit edge and the surface of the adjacent substrate edge) of the slit is 90 degrees.” The angle disclosed in Yoo et al. relates to the vertical wall of the slit 19 relative to the surface of the pixel electrode 18 in which the slits 19 are formed, as clearly described in col. 3, line 40-42. This 90 degree angle of the slits 19 of Yoo et al. is clearly shown in Fig. 1 of the reference.

In contrast, the claimed right angles in the present invention refer to the angle between the second slits which are formed in the second electrode and the first slits that are formed in the first electrode. In other words, the second slits are in a direction nearly at right angles with the direction in which the first slits extend. The fact that the edge of a slit 19 of

Yoo is at a 90 degree angle relative to the surface of the electrode in which the slit is formed does not disclose (or suggest) the angle between the first slits and the second slits which are formed in two different electrodes that face each other, as in the present invention. For this reason, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-7 are allowable over Yoo et al.

Claims 4 and 6-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoo et al. Applicant traverses this rejection for the reasons given with respect to claim 1, from which these claims depend, and because of the additional features that they recite.

For all of the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the claimed invention. The Examiner should contact Applicants' undersigned attorney if a telephone conference would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By



B. Joe Kim

Registration No. 41,895

August 16, 2004

Suite 2500
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 360-0080
Customer No. 24978

P:\DOCS\1324\68597\640562.DOC